



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/030,466	01/08/2002	Mario Sacchetti	US 19001	9169

7590

07/03/2003

William R Reid
Basell North America Inc
Intellectual Property
912 Appleton Road
Elkton, MD 21921

EXAMINER

BROWN, JENNINE M

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1755

8

DATE MAILED: 07/03/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No:

10/030,466

Applicant(s)

SACCHETTI ET AL.

Examiner

Jennine M. Brown

Art Unit

1755

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☒ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☒ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 5.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

Priority

Applicant has not complied with one or more conditions for receiving the benefit of an earlier filing date under 35 U.S.C. 119(e) or 120 as follows:

An application in which the benefits of an earlier application are desired must contain a specific reference to the prior application in the first sentence of the specification of in an application data sheet (37 CFR 1.78(a)(2) and (a)(5)). The specific reference to any prior nonprovisional application must include the relationship (i.e., continuation, divisional, or continuation-in-part) between the applications except when the reference is to a prior application of a CPA assigned the same application number.

Oath/Declaration

The oath or declaration is defective. A new oath or declaration in compliance with 37 CFR 1.67(a) identifying this application by application number and filing date is required. See MPEP §§ 602.01 and 602.02.

The oath or declaration is defective because:

It does not identify the foreign application for patent or inventor's certificate on which priority is claimed pursuant to 37 CFR 1.55, and any foreign application having a filing date before that of the application on which priority is claimed, by specifying the application number, country, day, month and year of its filing.

The file wrapper and bibliography sheet do not reflect the request for priority to EP 002017028 filed May 12, 2000 in the corrected filing receipt.

Art Unit: 1755

Specification

This application does not contain an abstract of the disclosure as required by 37 CFR 1.72(b). An abstract on a separate sheet is required.

Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Moman, et al. (US 6413901 B1).

Art Unit: 1755

Moman, et al. teach a prepolymerized catalyst component with surface area between 20 and 500 m²/g, total porosity higher than 0.2 cm³/g, and pore radius up to 10,000 Angstroms for the polymerization of ethylene with olefins (propylene, 1-butene, hexane, 4-methyl-1-pentene, and octane – col. 5, l. 20-37) and a catalyst comprising titanium compound (Ti (OR)_{n-y}X_y), magnesium dihalide compound such that amount of prepolymer is up to 100 g per g of solid catalyst component and aluminum to titanium ratio from 0.001 to 50 (col. 2, l. 63 – col. 3, l. 61; col. 4, l. 3-5, 8-10, 28-32, 37-38, 41-47, 50-60; col. 5, l. 5-19; Example 1).

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1, 4, 7, 8, 14 and 15 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-3, 7-9, 11-12 and 14-15 of U.S. Patent No. 6,423,660 B1. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the prepolymerized

Art Unit: 1755

catalyst component are made of the same composition, where overlapping molar ratio ranges between transition metal and aluminum occur, where overlapping ranges for the surface area and pore diameter also occur. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that the organic supports are identical or very similar and the catalyst composition requires titanium, aluminum and a halogen, which are described previously in the patent for olefin polymerization, therefore the claimed process and the patented process are obvious variants of one another.

Claims 1, 4, 7, 8, 14, 15, 16 and 19 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-2, 4-5, 7-11, 13, 18-20 and 23 of U.S. Patent No. 6399533 B2. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the prepolymerized catalyst component are made of the same composition, where overlapping molar ratio ranges between transition metal and aluminum occur, where overlapping ranges for the surface area and pore diameter also occur. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that the organic supports are identical or very similar and the catalyst composition requires titanium, aluminum and a halogen, which are described previously in the patent for olefin polymerization, therefore the claimed process and the patented process are obvious variants of one another.

Claims 1, 4, 5, 6, 9, 10, 11, 12 and 16 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-2 of U.S. Patent No. 6468938 B1. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are

Art Unit: 1755

not patentably distinct from each other because the prepolymerized catalyst component are made of the same composition, where titanium and magnesium dichloride compound are disclosed, the specific titanium compound is disclosed, the alpha olefins are disclosed, specifically propylene, and dealcoholating adducts are disclosed, therefore the claimed process and the patented process are obvious variants of one another.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jennine M. Brown whose telephone number is (703) 305-0435. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00 AM - 4:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mark Bell can be reached on (703) 308-3823. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 879-9310 for regular communications and (703) 872-9311 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0661.

jmb
June 18, 2003


Mark L. Bell
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Technology Center 1700